



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image"—strictly, while they violate it by erecting statues to eminent warriors and others; but this objection scarcely deserves a serious reply. The commandment must be taken as a whole; and the making of a graven image or likeness, which is forbidden in the first clause, is obviously limited by the words immediately following—namely, that it must not be done for the purposes of religious worship. Such is the view which the ancient Fathers uniformly take of the meaning of this commandment. In their arguments with the heathen philosophers they continually assert that the Almighty has condemned *all* use of images in religious worship as unlawful, whatever plausible reasons may be adduced in its support; and we cannot but lament the perversity which induces the Church of Rome, notwithstanding the plain declarations of both Scripture and primitive antiquity, to cling so pertinaciously to what we conceive to be a very dangerous error.

We have left ourselves space but for a word or two on the second subject in our correspondent's letter—namely, the miracles ascribed to Roman Catholic saints. "Sidrach" charges us with extreme gullibility, but we cannot see upon what grounds. Our East Indian correspondent stated two facts of which he was personally cognizant—namely, that there is a black image of the Virgin to be seen in a church at Tournay, and that the sextoness gave him a particular explanation of the origin of the phenomenon. We ask, what proof is this of gullibility? Our correspondent, we may confidently affirm, did not himself believe the story, nor did we. But "Sidrach," while declaiming loudly against knavery and credulity, does not explain why the priests of the Church of Rome allowed the black image to be erected in the Church of Tournay, unless they wished the people to believe the supposed miracle. The statue clearly could not have been placed there against their will; and unless they were illiterate, they could scarcely have imagined that the Virgin really had a black face. They either believed the miracle themselves, or they wished the people of Tournay to believe it; and in either case we fear that "Sidrach's" charges of knavery and credulity are but too truly applicable somewhere. We gladly concur with him in the very just remarks which he makes on the general character of miraculous interpositions, and the evidence by which they ought to be supported; but we shall hereafter, perhaps, take occasion to examine how far the principles which he so correctly lays down tend to establish or to refute some of the miracles which are sanctioned and acknowledged by the Church of Rome.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In your January number, in the article on the "Touchstone," reply to objection 24, the following passage appears:—"And Roman Catholics themselves must maintain that the words of institution cannot be understood absolutely literally; since, if we understand these words in their most literal sense, we must believe that it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, which is changed into blood." As you wish your correspondents to confine themselves to a single question in each letter, I shall, in this, confine myself to a few remarks upon the above passage, and shall not inquire into the truth or validity of the other arguments in the paper on the "Touchstone." It appears to me that, in your other reasons in reply to this objection, you can have but little confidence yourself, when you are compelled, in aid of them, to resort to such a reason as that contained in the passage I have quoted. In the first place, when you speak of Roman Catholics understanding "the words of institution" in a particular sense, you depart from the question in dispute. The question has no reference to "the words of institution," but to that part of those words which contains the assertion. Your proposition is, that the assertion, "this is my blood," must be taken figuratively, because the word "this" relates to an antecedent which is used in a figurative sense. This is your argument put into plain language; and it is no less illogical than would be the general proposition that wherever the subject is a figurative expression, the predicate, or the thing predicated of it, cannot be taken in a literal, but must be taken in a figurative sense.

I will take, as an illustration, a passage from your Protestant version of the Psalms:—"Mark the perfect man and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace." The word "upright," in its primary and literal sense, signifies "straight;" but, like many other words, it has acquired a figurative sense when applied to other than sensible objects, which sense is as well known and as generally received as its primary sense, or perhaps more so. If you asked me whether I understood the words—"the end of that man is peace"—in a literal or a figurative sense, and I answered, in a literal sense, you might or might not agree with me; but if I said, I can only understand them in a figurative sense, because if I took them in a literal sense I should also take the word "upright" in the same sense; and then it would follow that none but straight-backed men could hope for this promise of a peaceful end. If you did not laugh at my folly, you would, in your next number, assure

your "respected correspondent" that he had been guilty of very bad logic. The word "cup," however, to express the liquor in the cup, is as well known in that sense as in its literal sense. When we say "the kettle boils," though we use a figurative expression, yet we use an expression as well understood as the expression "the water in the kettle boils;" and so, in the 22nd Psalm (Douay version), the words, "the chalice which inebriateth me," is as familiar in its meaning as if it had been said "the liquor in the chalice." Independent of this, there is nothing in the Gospel to show that the word "this," in the words of institution, relates to the cup at all; but, on the contrary, the context shows that the liquor, and not the cup, is spoken of and referred to. Thus, in St. Matt. xxvi. 27, it is said—"And taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, drink ye all of this." *ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, "out of this." Drink what? Plainly, what was in the cup. And then, v. 27, our Saviour continues—"For this is my blood of the New Testament," &c. What is this? Plainly, what he had spoken of immediately before; what was in the chalice, and what he calls in the next verse—"this fruit of the vine." So, in St. Mark xiv. 23, it is said—"And having taken the chalice, and given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it;" not of the cup taken literally, which would be nonsense; but of the wine (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, again), "from," or "out of it." Then follow the words—"And he said to them, This is my blood," &c. So far the word "this" may as well apply to one object as another; it does not, even grammatically, necessarily apply to the cup any more than its contents. There is, however, in Luke xxii. 20, the expression—"This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood." Here the word "this" plainly relates to "chalice;" but unfortunately for your argument this chalice, taking it literally, is not asserted to be blood, but to be the testament in our Lord's blood. This is all that is to be found in the New Testament on this subject; and I, therefore, assert, that even in its literal sense, the cup or chalice is not asserted to be the blood. I also assert that the use of the name of a vessel to signify the thing contained in the vessel is so familiar in vulgar use, as to have, as it were, lost its figurative form in our minds, and that it cannot, therefore, be spoken of as a figurative expression, in the same manner as Protestants contend that the expression, "this is my blood," must be considered. And, lastly, I assert, that if the word "chalice" were ever so figurative, as here used, and if the word "this" ever so clearly applied to it, it would not follow that the rest of the sentence might not be read in its most literal sense; and that whether our Saviour spoke of the cup or the wine, would be a matter of perfect indifference, so far as relates to the question, in what sense the assertion he makes of that object, be it the cup or be it the wine, is to be understood.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
CATHOLICUS.

Our "respected correspondent," if we may venture to call him so without being taunted with the civility, has quite mistaken our meaning, in supposing that while we urge our friends and opponents to limit their communications to one subject at a time, we desire that they should confine themselves to a small part of a subject, or a single argument on one side or the other of any subject; on the contrary, we cordially desire that those who differ with us should come forward freely and manfully, and grapple with our arguments, and the whole of our arguments, upon every subject we discuss in our pages, and show us where we are in error, if we be so. We shall not be at all slow at admitting an error, either in matter of opinion or argument, if clear reasons be given us that it is an error. In the present case, our correspondent, "Catholicus," has not attempted to grapple with the main and important subject in question, whether our Blessed Lord spoke in a literal or in a figurative sense, when he said—"Take, eat; this is my body," and "This is my blood of the New Testament;" but merely criticizes an isolated argument, that "if we are to understand these words in the most literal sense, we must believe that it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, which is changed into blood." "Catholicus" is right in trying *this* by the rules of common sense; and ought, in order to be consistent, to be equally ready to try the meaning of the words—"Take, eat; this is my body," by the rule of common sense.

We may readily admit (what seems to be the whole drift of his argument) that whatever may be the exact form of words used, if we are quite sure what will be understood by them by the persons addressed, that it is enough; and that must be the *true* sense, unless the contrary is distinctly stated. When we say "the kettle boils," every one understands us to mean, "the water." When we say, pointing to a map—"This is England, and this is France," no one understands us to mean that England is literally a sheet of paper. And when Jesus, who had a few hours before called himself a shepherd, and a door, and a vine, took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples; and also took the cup, and gave it to them to drink; they certainly could not understand him to mean that he was holding his own body in his own hands, and

asking them to drink out of the cup his own blood, which they knew was still in his living body washed and not in the cup of wine. The *natural* sense of his words was the *figurative*; and if the Disciples were mistaken in so understanding him, of which there is no proof whatever, when and where is the mistake explained?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—A layman often runs the risk of bringing forward as a novelty some combination of facts and arguments that the theologian thinks too familiar to mention. If, however, the information be such as is but little known to the unlearned, then to give it an extended publicity may effect as much practical good as to discover it for the first time. I, therefore, venture to call your attention to a text incessantly paraded as a proof of most various doctrines, and to a commentary on it that is little known, at least among us laymen. I mean the verse, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—Mat. xvi. 18.

The infallibility of the Church—meaning thereby its ecclesiastics—the infallibility of the Pope, and the necessity for adding the latter to the former, to produce an infallible resultant, are, by turns, proved by this isolated passage. It is quoted by the ignorant, who have no knowledge of Scripture but through such traditional quotations, and with more caution by the skilful controversialist. The Italian, who cannot see the Word of God, and learns his theology from the paintings, sculpture, and decorations of his temples, sees this verse written in gigantic letters of gold, some ten feet long, beneath the majestic dome of the fabric dedicated to the apostle whose successors it is supposed thus to exalt to superhuman power. In short, it meets one so often that it is natural to ask, not only what is its true meaning, but what is the interpretation given by the infallible interpreter, which all Roman Catholics are bound to accept as true. I do not profess to have discovered any such for the entire passage, though at some pains to do so; but I think there is one tolerably distinct upon the most important point—namely, What is the *foundation* on which the Church is built?

You, sir, may point out what has been said by the Fathers; my researches suffice to show that there is, at least, not that "unanimous consent" the Roman Catholic creed demands. The foundation is variously given—as St. Peter—as St. Peter with the Popes claiming as his successors—as our Lord himself—or as the confession of faith in Christ just made by St. Peter, and which called forth the expression. The second alone supplies Roman Catholics with any peculiar argument in their favour, and to the latter Protestants can offer no objection in point of doctrine, even if they do not quite agree in its correctness. Would it not be strange if this were the very interpretation that Roman Catholics are bound to adopt? I must believe it to be so, until some equally authoritative council shall rescind, or explain so as to annul, the following passage in the celebrated Council of Trent. * After noticing the propriety of opening their proceedings with a solemn confession of faith, it thus proceeds—"Wherefore it has thought good that the symbol of faith, which the Holy Roman Church makes use of, as being that principle wherein all who profess the faith of Christ must necessarily agree, and that firm and ONLY FOUNDATION against which the gates of hell shall never prevail,† be expressed in the very same words in which it is read in all the churches; which is as follows." Here is given the Creed, known as the Nicene, in the words given in the note,‡ and which every Protestant cordially believes, and will readily accept as the foundation of his faith and hopes, as well as of those believers, throughout all times and places, who form the Church to which he claims to belong. The language of the council is distinct: the reference identifies its object. Those who assert the infallibility of the council must yield to its decree. If they say I am mistaken in the meaning I put on it, let them point out how and why; I have as much right and capacity to explain its language as they, for in that they claim no infallible assistance. Who shall interpret the interpreters? But, in truth, there is no ambiguity; it is plainly stated, that the *only* foundation,

* Session III.

† "Matt. xvi." The original edition has no marginal references whatsoever to texts of Scripture; but those printed since, under ecclesiastical sanction, have, though it is hardly requisite that so familiar a verse should be thus formally identified.

‡ "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things, visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; and born of the Father before all ages; God of God, light of light, very God of very God; begotten not made; of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made: who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from the heavens, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; he suffered and was buried; and he rose again on the third day, according to the Scriptures; and he ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and again will come with glory to judge the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end; and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and Son; who with the Father and the Son together, is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets: and one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."

alluded to in that verse, on which Christ's Church is built, is the profession of faith in Christ, unclogged by any sectarian tenets, and such as every Protestant accepts; and it is, at least, insinuated, that the Church there referred to embraces "ALL who profess the faith of Christ." If so, why do bishops and Popes allow, day after day, a use to be made of this text, to their own exaltation, which they should know, if they would refer to the original archives of their doctrine, is a direct contradiction of their Church's teaching?

FONTIUM PETITOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Having observed the kind manner in which you answer all communications like the following, I feel no hesitation in sending you this, hoping to find an answer in the columns of your CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

I remain, sir, your humble servant,

J. C.

Into what place did the soul of our Saviour descend immediately after death? David, speaking of Christ, says, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell;" and St. Peter, referring to this says, "whom God hath raised up, having loosed the sorrows of hell, as it was impossible that he should be holden by it." The Creed and the 3rd Article of the Church of England also says, "He descended into hell." Is this understood as the hell of the damned? if so, where did the thief on the cross go, as Christ promised him he should be with him that day in paradise? If there is a third place called Hades, what souls are supposed to be there, or for what purpose? and if Christ went to a place where there were sorrows, what is the meaning of the words, "it is finished?"

A NOVICE.

We are happy to be able to answer our correspondent's question. He has been misled by the Douay translation, in the meaning of the passage which he quotes from St. Peter—"Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the sorrows of hell."—Acts ii. 24. The translation in the authorized version is the correct one—"having loosed the pains of death." The Greek is, *λυσας τας ωδυνας του θανατου*. The words of the Psalm, quoted by St. Peter, in verses 27 and 31 are—*εις αδου*. No scholar will pretend to say that the word *θανατου*, in verse 24, and the word *αδου* in verses 27 and 31, should all be translated "hell," as in the Douay Bible. The Douay translation had some excuse, because they professed only to translate the Latin Bible, which has the word "infernus" in all these places; but it was the Greek, and not the Latin, that was written by the inspired Evangelist St. Luke. The note in the Douay Bible on verse 34 goes far to correct this mistake, for it thus explains—"having loosed the sorrows of hell"—viz., "having overcome the grievous pains of death, and all the power of hell." In former editions of the Douay Bible, the note on verse 27 stood thus—"As his soul suffered no pains in hell, so neither did his body take any corruption in the grave." Therefore it is clear that no question arises out of verse 24, or, as we believe, out of any other passage of Scripture, concerning Christ having gone "to a place where there were sorrows;" and there is no reason to doubt that the words "it is finished," did mean that the whole of what Christ had to suffer for the redemption of man was finished by his death on the cross.

In reference to the words which David spoke of Christ, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," our correspondent asks—"Into what place did the soul of our Saviour descend immediately after death?" To this we answer, that the Greek word is "Hades;" and we learn from it no more than that word properly expresses. We must always keep in mind, in considering such questions, what St. Augustine observes—"The name of hell is variously put in Scripture, and is in many meanings, according as the sense of the things which are treated of doth require." The proper meaning of the Greek word is "the place which is unseen." The fathers often use it in this general sense for the world of spirits; that world which we cannot see. Thus Andreas Cæsariensis—"Death is the separation of the soul and body; but Hades is a place to us invisible, or unseen and unknown, which receiveth our souls when they depart from hence."

We have not room for many more proofs, but there is one passage so appropriate that our correspondent may like to see it. St. Gregory Nyssen has recorded a conversation between him and Macrina, the sister of St. Basil, in which Gregory says—"Where is that name of Hades so much spoken of—which is so much treated of in our common conversation—so much in the writings both of the heathen and our own—into which all men think that the souls are translated from hence as into a certain receptacle?" To which Macrina replies—"It appeareth that thou hast not given much heed to my speech, for when I spake of the translation of the soul from that which is seen, unto that which is invisible, I thought I had left nothing behind to be required of Hades. Neither doth that name, wherein souls are said to be, seem to signify any other thing, either in profane writers, or in the Holy Scriptures, save only a removing into that which is invisible and unseen."—Greg. Nyssen, in *Macrinis*, oper. Tom. 3, p. 209. We believe this to be a perfectly correct explanation of the word. We are

sure it does not necessarily express the hell of the damned. Our Saviour said to the thief on the cross—"This day shalt thou be with me in paradise." That paradise belongs to the unseen world, and is fitly called "Hades."

It may interest our correspondent and our readers to show them a more profitable view of Christ's going to Hades than controversy commonly suggests. There were numerous heretics in old times, who denied that Christ had a human soul. They said that the Son of God took the body of man, but not the soul of a man. If that were so, then Christ could not have experienced himself the temptations or the spiritual trials of man; for neither God, nor the human body is capable of feeling those trials. This denial of Christ being perfect man, "of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting," as well as perfect God, totally destroyed all foundation for the belief in our Saviour's fellow-feeling for us. St. Paul shows us the importance of this doctrine for our comfort and support, when he says—"Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people, for in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted."—Hebrews ii. 17, 18. What a comfort to be able to say, in all our spiritual trials, as well as all our bodily infirmities, "I know that my Saviour can feel for this, for he felt it all himself!" But the heresy we speak of took away this comfort, for if the man Christ Jesus had not a human soul, he could never have felt the temptations or the trials of the soul. Of course temptation never led him to sin, but he felt what temptation is; but his soul alone could feel this. Against this heresy the Fathers always argued from this text—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." If Christ went to the place of departed souls, it must have been his soul that went there. Christ is therefore perfect man—"In all things made like unto his brethren." We know then that he can feel for our spiritual trials, and that he knows how to succour them. May we learn practically this lesson from his departure to Hades, and it will be more to our real comfort than all our vain inquiries and guesses about the exact particulars of the place he went to.

Notes and Queries.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I am anxious to learn by whom the celibacy of the clergy was ordained. Was it by Christ, or by his Apostles, or the Church in after times? Is it the law of God or of men? And what does the Church of Rome say in answer to this question?

I have asked several persons likely to know, and some priests of the Church of Rome; and I cannot get a satisfactory answer. And without an answer to this question I cannot make up my mind on the subject. I have thought that you, perhaps, may be able to give me an answer.

Yours, &c.,

AN INQUIRER.

If some of our Roman Catholic correspondents will give us an answer, as to what their Church holds on this subject, we shall be happy to publish it in our next number.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR FEBRUARY.

(From the Irish Farmers' Gazette.)

Wheat Sowing.—From the extreme wetness of the past season wheat sowing will, in all probability, form the principal operation of this month in the wheat-growing districts. Such lands as have been prepared for sowing wheat some months since, and have remained unsown from the wetness of the season, will now require the additional preparation of a good harrowing, as soon as it is dry enough, and will be most appropriately sown under the plough, giving about a three-inch furrow. If the land be at all inclined to wet, it will be best to plough it in ridges; but if sufficiently dry, may be ploughed into wide sets: or if intended for laying down with grass and clover seeds, may be ribbed up at 18 inch intervals, sown broadcast, and then harrowed down lengthways with a short-tined harrow. In harrowing the land to be sown under the plough, no more should be harrowed than can be sown and ploughed in the same day, lest rain should come on, when the land would not dry so soon after as if it remained rough. The same rule applies to land to be ribbed, as no more should be harrowed than can be ribbed in a day. We lately gave some general hints as to the kinds most suitable for sowing at this season, to which we may add, that the better the land is prepared the less the quantity of seed that will be necessary, as the depth of cover will be more equal and regular; whereas, when the land is roughly and slovenly prepared, a greater quantity of seed will be required, from the quantity likely to be covered so deep as to preclude any chance of its vegetating. The weight per acre, also, must be regulated by the size of the grain, as it will take more of a large-sized grain than a small-sized one, the smaller, provided it be well formed, plump, and sound, making the best

according to its variety. Wheat, when sown early in the season, may be sown thin in kind, rich soils, as it stools or tillers abundantly and equally; but as the season advances the quantity of seed should be increased, to prevent tillering, which would then, if encouraged, be unequal in time and growth, and ripen unevenly, some heads being ripe, while others from the same stool would be green. Lime from 30 to 40 barrels, with salt from a half to one ton per Irish acre, or two to four cwt. guano, spread evenly and harrowed in along with the seed, if there should be a doubt of the land being sufficiently rich, will materially assist in producing a good crop, and bring it early to maturity.

Beans should be sown as early as possible in the month, provided the land has been previously well prepared and manured. Drilling at from 2½ to 3 feet intervals, the seed being dropped 4 inches apart, is much the best practice, as it gives sufficient room for horse and hand hoeing. If the land has not been manured in the autumn, a speedy mode of getting in the crop may be put in operation by putting out the manure in equidistant heaps and rows; and as the land is ploughed drop the beans in every third furrow, covering them with the dung: or the dung may be put in first, and the beans on top; the next furrow covers all; the rows will then stand at about 27 inches apart. Beans may also be sown broadcast in well-manured and well-prepared land, and harrowed in. The produce is generally excellent; but the land should be clean, as there will be no opportunity for cleaning it while occupied by the crop. The Russia bean is hardy and productive; but the following kinds may be relied on for sowing at this season:—The Heliogoland, tick, or Egyptian, for cattle; and the early Mazagan, or long pod, for human use. It will take from 3½ to 4 bushels, according to size, to sow an Irish acre broadcast, or 2 bushels sown in drills. A strong, deep loam is best for beans; and if well manured they make an excellent preparatory crop for wheat.

Peas, if required early, may be sown now; but if not, it may be profitably put off till the end of the month. This crop succeeds best on a lighter and drier soil than beans; and, unless the land be very poor, there is no manure required, as, if rich, the crop runs too much to haulm, and will be tardy in podding, and late in ripening. They may be sown broadcast, or in drills, at 15 to 18 inch intervals, to allow of hoeing in the early part of the season; but they soon cover the ground, which precludes the possibility of going through them. A few beans may be appropriately mixed with the seed; they serve to support the peas, and keep them off the ground, and when thrashed the beans are easily separated from the peas by a suitable riddle.

Oats.—Black oats may be sown about the middle of the month; but the white varieties are best sown about the beginning of next month.

Parsnips may be sown any time during the month, in previously well-prepared, rich, and deep soils. The land intended for this crop should have been deeply tilled, cleaned, and well manured in the autumn; but if the manuring be put off till the spring, the manure to be applied then should be well decomposed, and intimately mixed with the soil. Sow in drills 28 inches apart, the plants to be afterwards thinned out, that they may not stand nearer than nine inches apart. The varieties most generally sown are the common and the Jersey hollow-crowned. We saw a variety shown, a few years back, at the Royal Horticultural Society's show, called the turnip-rooted, which seemed very well adapted for shallow soils; but we have lost sight of it for some time. Though parsnips may be sown now with great advantage, we do not recommend the general crop to be sown, but a limited portion. The sowing of the general crop will be best made early next month.

Fattening Pigs should be well and sufficiently supplied with steamed or boiled turnips, mangels, sugar-beet, parsnips, or carrots. They will thrive on all the above roots, either raw or boiled, except the turnips, which should be cooked; but to produce good pork and bacon, they should also get bean, pea, barley, or oatmeal with the roots. Their troughs should be cleaned out as soon as done feeding, and the refuse given the young and store pigs. All should have free access to fresh water.

Fattening Calves and House-fed Lambs require great care and attention, and should have abundance of good cows' milk, with good, dry, and warm lodging and clean beds. To prevent the milk coagulating in the stomach, they should have some chalk and common salt beat up and kneaded together, let to dry, and laid in lumps in their troughs.

Odds and Ends.—Proceed with the draining and subsoiling in hands, to completion, as preparation for, and getting in the crops will now require undivided attention. Look to the mouths of the drains, and clear away all stoppages, and remedy and repair all defects. Increase your manure and compost heaps by every means within your power; purchase and carry home the quantity of artificial manures necessary for the season, so as to have them in store when required. Turn over, mix, and pulverize compost-heaps. Keep the store stock well supplied with fresh-thrashed sound straw and turnips; and scour drains, ditches, and water-courses.